

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10 and 12 are amended. No new matter is added.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Nguyen in the May 16, 2007 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action (i) rejects claims 1-5 and 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,750,833 to Kasai; and (ii) rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,734,636 to Sanford et al. (Sanford). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 9 are amended to more clearly recite that the impulse driving is done more than once by alternately and repeatedly applying a forward bias and a reverse bias to the electro-optical element. Claims 9, 10 and 12 also are amended to improve their readability.

A. Kasai

Kasai discloses various embodiments for a driving circuit 1 that drives an organic electroluminescent element 10 for use in displays (Figs. 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10). A driving transistor Tr1 drives organic electroluminescent element 10. Switch 21, driving transistor Tr1, organic electroluminescent element 10, and switch 22 are connected in series (Fig. 2). Switches 21 and 22 can each switch between Vcc and Gnd. When one switch is connected to Vcc, the other is connected to Gnd, and vice versa. Thus, reverse bias of electroluminescent element 10 can be achieved by switching switches 21 and 22 in tandem (Fig. 2; col. 8, lines 4-10). Fig. 3 shows a timing diagram for the operation of the circuit of Fig. 2 showing

the effect of switching switches 21 and 22. Kasai only shows that there is one reversal of the bias to organic electroluminescent element 10 during a single scan cycle.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 9, Kasai fails to disclose (1) "a power supply line control circuit to perform impulse driving of the electro-optical element more than once" and (2) "alternately and repeatedly applying a forward bias and a reverse bias to the electro-optical element during a period of time from the moment in which the scanning line corresponding to the pixel in which the data is to be written is selected, to the moment in which the same scanning line is selected again."

B. Sanford

Sanford discloses a drive circuit that drives an organic light emitting diode (OLED). In Fig. 3, pixel circuit 300 includes OLED 320, connected to NFET Q303 which, in turn, is connected to positive supply voltage Vdd. The other end of OLED 20 is connected to switch 325 which connects to Vss2 (high) when data is being written to pixel circuit 300 and to Vss1 (low) when the data written to circuit 300 is being read (col. 6, lines 22-27). Thus, the switch 325 only allows the OLED 320 to be driven when the switch is connected to Vss1. It is not necessarily true that the OLED 320 is reverse biased when the switch 325 is connected to Vss2 because reverse biasing of OLED 320 in this situation requires that the voltage on the upper side of OLED 20 (Fig. 3) be less than Vss2, which may not be the case.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 9, because Sanford does not disclose a display and only discloses a single OLED driving circuit, Sanford fails to disclose a plurality of scanning lines, data lines, or pixels; a scanning line driving circuit; or a data line driving circuit.

Sanford further fails to disclose (1) "a power supply line control circuit to perform impulse driving of an electro-optical element more than once," and (2) "alternately and repeatedly applying a forward bias and a reverse bias to the electro-optical element during a

period of time from the moment in which the scanning line corresponding to the pixel in which the data is to be written is selected, to the moment in which the same scanning line is selected again."

As agreed at the personal interview, the claims distinguish over Kasai and Sanford. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/ccs

Date: May 17, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
